



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/695,272	10/27/2003	Hiromitsu Nakaoka	12844.49US01	4693	
52835	7590	09/04/2007	EXAMINER		
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			NGUYEN, JIMMY H		
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2629	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		09/04/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/695,272

Applicant(s)

NAKAOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Jimmy H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2629

-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 17-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5,8,9,12,13,15 and 16.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.


Jimmy H. Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2629

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same reasons set forth in the Office action dated 5/16/2007. Applicant's argument with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, to claim 19 as failing to comply with the written description requirement, see pages 7-8 of the amendment, has been fully considered but it is not persuasive because the original disclosure, specifically the specification, pages 8-13 as indicated by Applicant, does not explicitly teach a PWM controller included in the signal side driving portion/circuit (30), as presently recited in claim 19. Note that Fig. 2 shows all elements included in the signal side driving circuit (30), but none of them being a PWM controller. Also, the term, "a PWM controller", is not even found in the original disclosure. Accordingly, this rejection is maintained.

With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) by Yamazaki '326, Applicant argues that Figs. 3-20 and the corresponding description do not teach the invention of claims 17-19 (see page 8 of the amendment-after-final). Examiner directs the Applicant to Figs. 2A-2C and the corresponding description as discussed in the Office action dated 5/16/2007. Accordingly, this rejection is maintained.

With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) by Yamaguchi '084, Applicant argues that Yamaguchi does not teach using PWM signals (see page 9 of the amendment). Examiner disagrees because any signal comprising pulses is considered to be a PWM signal. Therefore, signals applied to the data/signal electrodes (X1, X2,...) and shown in Figs. 3A-3B are PWM signals. Further, Applicant argues that Yamaguchi does not teach switching between a rearward/forward combination approach and a forward/rearward combination approach in every frame cycle (see page 9 of the amendment). Examiner disagrees because Figs. 3A-3C of Yamaguchi explicitly show the first (positive voltage application mode) and second (negative voltage application mode) frames and switching between a rearward/forward combination approach and a forward/rearward combination approach in every frame cycle (e.g., Fig. 3B shows a forward/rearward combination approach during a first frame and a rearward/forward combination approach during a second frame). Accordingly, this rejection is maintained.

With respect to the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Yasunishi and Hanami, Applicant argues that there is no alternation of approaches between adjacent electrodes (see pages 9-10 of the amendment-after-final). Examiner agrees; however, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the combination of Yasunishi and Hanami would yield an alternation of approaches between adjacent electrodes as presently claimed. Accordingly, this rejection is maintained.